



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,924	03/08/2005	Johannes Marra	NL 020878	7552

24737 7590 05/19/2006

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
----------

REHM, ADAM C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2875

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the following must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

1) A light-transmitting element with an optically roughened surface facing towards the light source per Claim 13

2) A light-transmitting element with an optically roughened surface facing towards the powder per Claim 14

3) Two substantially parallel, substantially optically smooth surfaces per Claim 15

4) The surface of the lighting fixture per Claim 15

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New

Art Unit: 2875

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 recites the limitations: (1) the surface of the light-transmitting element that faces towards the light source; (2) the surface of the lighting fixture facing toward the lamp; and (3) "the lamp" in Lines 1-4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MABE ET AL. (US 6,568,840), which discloses a lighting device comprising:

- At least one light source (15);
- A light reflector disposed beside the light source for reflecting light therefrom (10);

- The light reflector comprising a synthetic, light-transmitting element bounding a space (3, lamp body; Claim 1);
- Diffusely reflective free-flowing, pigmented/colored powder present inside said space (101/121/122, Column 3, Line 66-Column 4, Line 8; Column 4, Lines 53-63);
- Wherein the space is bounded by a second light transmitting element (2);
- Wherein the space is bounded by a housing (13); and
- A roughened light-transmitting element with a roughened surface facing the light source (113, Fig. 4A; Column 4, Lines 49-52).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MABE ET AL. (US 6,568,840) and ONO (US 6,830,354). MABE substantially discloses the claimed invention including a diffusively reflective optical powder comprised of aluminum (101/121/122), but does not disclose such a powder comprised of aluminum oxide of a particular diameter or wt.
5. Regarding the slight change in material, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the

Art Unit: 2875

intended use. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. Further, ONO teaches the use of aluminum oxide as a reflective material (Column 10, Lines 26-32).

6. Regarding the specific diameter and wt., a change in the size of an existing element is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237. Likewise, a change in form of any element of prior patent must result in more than useful natural phenomenon that man has accumulated through common knowledge. *Span-Deck Inc. v. Fab-Con Inc.*, 215 USPQ 835.

7. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify MABE and use the aluminum oxide as taught by ONO in order to provide a reflective surface. Additionally, it would have been obvious to exercise common engineering principles and experiment with the size of the powder in order to derive an optimum powder size in order to achieve optimal light reflective properties.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MABE ET AL. (US 6,568,840). MABE substantially discloses the claimed invention including a space (13), but does not disclose the specific space thickness. However, a change in the size of an existing element is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237. Likewise, a change in form of any element of prior patent must result in more than useful natural phenomenon that man has accumulated through common knowledge. *Span-Deck Inc. v. Fab-Con Inc.*, 215 USPQ 835. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify MABE and utilize a space as claimed for the purpose of obtaining optimum light qualities.

Art Unit: 2875

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MABE ET AL. (US 6,568,840), which substantially discloses the claimed invention including a light-transmitting element with an optically roughened surface (113), but does not disclose such a light transmitting element facing towards the powder being optically roughened. However, Applicant admits that the use of a roughened surface to manipulate light is known in the art (Page 1, Lines 22-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify MABE and use the optically roughened surface as taught by Applicant's admitted prior art in order to manipulate light in order to have a desired effect.

10. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MABE ET AL. (US 6,568,840), which discloses a lighting device method for manufacture comprising:

- At least one light source (15);
- A lighting fixture (13);
- A light reflector arranged beside the light source for diffuse reflection (10);
- A light-transmitting element bounding a space having two parallel optically smooth surfaces (2);
- Wherein a surface that faces towards the light source extends parallel to a surface of the lighting fixture facing the lamp (3; inner and outer surfaces); and
- Diffusely reflective powder present inside the space (111).

11. While MABE substantially discloses the claimed invention, MABE does not disclose a specularly reflective surface. However, Applicant admits that such is known

Art Unit: 2875

in the art (Page 2, Line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify MABE and use the specularly reflective surface as taught by Applicant's admitted prior art in order to provide desired reflection.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

12. MARRA ET AL. (US 2005/0237744) employs both specularly and diffusively reflective materials of aluminum oxide.
13. HOELEN ET AL. (US 2005/0180167) teaches use of a specularly or diffusively reflective material.
14. ZIMMERMAN ET AL. (US 2004/0233655) employs both a specularly and diffusively reflective material.
15. GUERRIERI (US 6,857,771) discloses a light stick with reflective powder.
16. ZOU ET AL. (US 6,550,942) discloses use of a specularly or diffusively reflector of aluminum oxide.
17. WILSON (US 6,299,328) discloses use of a specularly or diffusively reflector of aluminum oxide.

### ***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam C. Rehm whose telephone number is 571.272.8589. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30 EST.



Art Unit: 2875

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 571.272.2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ACR  
5/4/2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. M. Sember', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

THOMAS M. SEMBER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER